

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF MAINE**

<b>BEVERLY A. LAVIGNE,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>PLAINTIFF</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>CIVIL No. 1:13-cv-397-DBH</b>
	)	
<b>FRANKLIN COUNTY COURT, ET AL.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>DEFENDANTS</b>	)	

**ORDER ON PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO RE-OPEN CASE**

The motion to re-open the case is **DENIED**.

By the time I made my ruling on July 31, 2014 (ECF No. 71), I had read thoroughly Ms. Lavigne’s Objection to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommended Decision, which Lavigne filed on July 30, 2014. (The Report and Recommended Decision is ECF No. 67 and the Objection is ECF No. 70.) I found nothing in the Objection that would support rejecting the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommended Decision. It is true that on August 5, 2014, Ms. Lavigne filed documents that the Clerk’s Office characterized as “Correspondence” (ECF No. 73). They appeared to be exhibits for her July 30 Objection. But the late-filed exhibits did not alter my conclusion that the Magistrate Judge’s decision should be affirmed.

**SO ORDERED.**

**DATED THIS 20<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2014**

/s/D. BROCK HORNBY  
**D. BROCK HORNBY**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**